

Third Series Vol. II part 2.

No. 212

Autumn 2006

ISSN 0010-003X

Price £12.00

# THE COAT OF ARMS

an heraldic journal published twice yearly by The Heraldry Society



# THE COAT OF ARMS

*The journal of the Heraldry Society*



Third series

Volume III

**2007**

Part 1

*Number 213 in the original series started in 1952*

The Coat of Arms is published twice a year by The Heraldry Society, whose registered office is 53 High Street, Burnham, Slough SL1 7JX. The Society was registered in England in 1956 as registered charity no. 241456.

*Founding Editor*

†John Brooke-Little, C.V.O., M.A., F.H.S.

*Honorary Editors*

C. E. A. Cheesman, M.A., PH.D., Rouge Dragon Pursuivant

M. P. D. O'Donoghue, M.A., Bluemantle Pursuivant

*Editorial Committee*

Adrian Ailes, B.A., F.S.A., F.H.S.

Jackson W. Armstrong, B.A.

Andrew Hanham, B.A., PH.D.

*Advertising Manager*

John Tunesi of Liongam

## SHORTER NOTE

**Thomas Jenyns' book and its precursors.** *Steen Clemmensen writes:* Comparative heraldry is a rare endeavour and the article by Paul A. Fox (*CoA* 3rd ser. 2, pp. 97-102) is a welcome and well-argued review of the three fourteenth-century ordinaries named for Thomas Jenyns (TJ), Cooke (CKO) and Cotgrave (CG). His dating of the collation or major editing (c. 1398) of Jenyns' Ordinary, its multi-source origins, the production (c. 1440) and provenance of the 'Queen Margaret' manuscript (QMJ), and his attribution of the collation to the court of Richard II are all very persuasive. Where one might disagree is mainly in the relationship between the members of the group and on some of the supporting statements, e.g. the rarity of updating on copying.

Allow me to note that the QMJ (BL, Add. Ms 40851) has recently been published (Emmanuel de Boos, *L'Armorial ordonné de la reine Marguerite*, Paris 2004) with a different numeration of 1,661 items including two *ex-libris* and one blank, but few individual identifications, the ordinary being QMJ:2-1261 (similar to TJ:2-1211). I preface my remarks with the admission that I have never seen any of manuscripts mentioned above and that my comments are based on the available transcriptions.

At the bottom of p. 98 Dr Fox states that no item, apart from Stanley and Woodville, requires a date so late as Henry IV (1399-1413). This is plainly wrong, as QMJ:1581 for 'andrieu hugarde de danmark', also in MY:257 as 'ogard', is for Anders Petersen (Gyldenstjerne) of the manor of Aagaard in Jutland, who served John, Duke of Bedford, as second chamberlain in 1425 and captain of Vire in 1433 and was naturalised by act of Parliament that year and died c. 1454. He was ancestor of the Haggards of Bradenham. So some kind of editing must have been done in the early fifteenth century.

Contrary to Dr Fox's assertion of that updating of precursor documents is rare, examples are quite common in the re-use of continental armorials, and one will probably find more when English armorials are critically reviewed. Parts of the Navarre armorial (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, Ms fr. 14356) were stripped of forenames and brisures when re-used to make parts of the Berry armorial (published by E. de Boos, *Armorial de Gilles le Bouvier dit héraut Berry*, Paris 1995; the concordance was reviewed by me at the 26th International Congress of Heraldic and Genealogical Sciences, Bruges 2004), as Cooke's Ordinary was for a large part of Cotgrave's. In a segment of 124 items of the Cour Amoureuse roll (published by C. Bozzolo and H. Loyau, Paris 1982) used for the Charolais roll (Paris, Bibliothèque de l' Arsenal, Ms. 4150) there are at least eighteen changes of forenames. Between Cooke's Ordinary, Jenyns and the Ashmolean Roll (*CEMRA* p. 57) there are some 50 differences in forenames.

Finding all the sources of a composite armorial, whether it be an ordinary or not, is a nearly impossible task – and also presents a problem of definition. Dr Fox claims

## THE COAT OF ARMS

the existence of a lost ordinary of at least 565 items as the major source of Jenyns' Ordinary. To me this appears to be a copy of Cooke of 646 items with an overlap of 556 items (by my count), and not a separate ordinary. The major problem of Cooke, as we know it, is that of the 189 forenames supplied only by Jenyns. But this might only be a problem in the surviving copies, not one that was here in the origin. Already Wagner (*CEMRA* pp. 60 and 74) pointed to the probability that the major source for Cooke was the Ashmolean Roll. And there is an overlap of 76% in arms and names between Ashmolean and Cooke, and most of the forenames in this overlap are similar in Jenyns and Ashmolean. There are several arguments for (a copy of) Cooke being the core of Jenyns, one being the concordance without interruption of several subsequences, another the presence of curious markers, such as 'richard le jeu/jon/den' in AS:178, CKO:65, CG:68\* and QMJ:37, possibly for Richard 'the young', a relative of Wakelin Arderne in AS:179, CKO:64 and QMJ:36. Where the remaining parts of Jenyns come from is much more difficult to ascertain. Some might have been extracted from earlier rolls such as Grimaldi's (*CEMRA* p. 62) or Powell's (*CEMRA* p. 61), both nearly contemporary with Cooke. What Dr Fox has probably considered, but did not mention, is that parts might have been copied from painted rolls, while other items derived from blazoned notes, incorporating mistakes in both legend and blazon, e.g. CG:68 has *Or lion vair ch fess gules*, while the equivalent entry in others is *Vert lion or ch. fess gules*.

Lastly, for 10% of Jenyns' Ordinary and 25% of Jenyns' Roll, there is no other occurrence in the *DBA* or armorials available to me. For such reasons alone, we must hope that Dr Fox will have the opportunity to publish his attributions and references fully.

*Paul A. Fox responds:* I thank Mr Clemmensen for his kind words about my paper and for pointing out a third late intrusive shield based on his particular knowledge of Danish heraldry. It is highly probable that Anders Petersen had some connection with the house of Stanley. Mr Clemmensen has taken out of context my comment (footnote 13) that there are very few examples of the updating of names in Thomas Jenyns, as a comment on ordinaries in general. I would not presume to make such a statement, having had little opportunity to examine many of the continental ordinaries. My notes being voluminous are unlikely to be published, but a copy will be deposited at the Society of Antiquaries in due course, and I am most happy to provide anyone interested with an electronic version.